



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/714,489	11/14/2003	Hau H. Duong	067456-5012-US02	1026
67374	7590	04/14/2009	EXAMINER	
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP			LU, FRANK WEI MIN	
ONE MARKET SPEAR STREET TOWER			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105			1634	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/14/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/714,489	<b>Applicant(s)</b> DUONG ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> FRANK W. LU	<b>Art Unit</b> 1634

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 January 2009.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 12-25 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 14-16 and 19 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 12, 13, 17, 18, and 20-25 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 14 November 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### ***CONTINUED EXAMINATION UNDER 37 CFR 1.114 AFTER FINAL REJECTION***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission of RCE and the amendment filed on January 21, 2009 have been entered. The claims pending in this application are claims 12-25 wherein claims 14-16 and 19 have been withdrawn due to species election mailed on May 27, 2007. Rejection and/or objection not reiterated from the previous office action are hereby withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment filed on January 21, 2009. Claims 12, 13, 17, 18, and 20-25 will be examined.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 12, 13, 17, 18, and 20-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4. Claim 13 or 22 or 23 or 24 recites the limitation "the characteristic waveform" in the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim because there is no "characteristic waveform" in claim 25. Please clarify.

Art Unit: 1634

5. Claim 25 is rejected as vague and indefinite. Since any part of a molecule which can transfer an electron can be considered as electron transfer moiety (ETM), the assay complex comprises a target analyte, a capture analyte and an electron transfer moiety, and the claim does not indicate how an output waveform generated from an input waveform can be determined as an output waveform that characteristic of the presence of said ETM, it is unclear why an output waveform generated from an input waveform can be an output waveform that characteristic of the presence of said ETM and cannot be an output waveform that characteristic of the presence of said capture binding ligand. Please clarify.

6. Claim 25 is rejected as vague and indefinite because it is unclear that the analyzing step comprises peak recognition of what. Please clarify.

#### ***Double Patenting***

7. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

8. Claims 12, 13, 17, 18, and 20-25 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-27 of U.S. Patent No. 6,740,518 B1. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the examined claims in this instant application are either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claims. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969). Although claims 12, 13, 17, 18, and 20-25 in this instant application are not identical to claims 1-27 of U.S. Patent No. 6,740,518 B1, the contents of U.S. Patent No. 6,740,518 B1 teach that electronic detection is by chronocoulometry (see column 85, last paragraph bridging to column 86, first paragraph), the output current is fed into the lock-in amplifier (see column 103), ETM can be transition metal complexes (see column 14, 29-48), and the AC frequency ranges from about 0.01 Hz to about 100 MHz, with from about 10 Hz to about 10 MHz being preferred, and from about 100 Hz to about 20 MHz being especially preferred (see column 79, lines 25-41), claims 1-27 of U.S. Patent No. 6,740,518 B1 are directed to the same subject matter and fall entirely within the scope of claims 12, 13, 17, 18, and 20-25 in this instant application. In other words, claims 12, 13, 17, 18, and 20-25 in this instant application are anticipated by claims 1-27 of U.S. Patent No. 6,740,518 B1.

### ***Conclusion***

9. No claim is allowed.

Art Unit: 1634

10. Papers related to this application may be submitted to Group 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Group 1600 via the PTO Fax Center. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1988), 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993), and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993)(See 37 CAR § 1.6(d)). The CM Fax Center number is (571)273-8300.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Frank Lu, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (571)272-0746. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9 A.M. to 5 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ram Shukla, can be reached on (571)272-0735.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to (571) 272-0547.

/Frank W Lu /  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1634  
April 8, 2009